TUESDAY, JANUARY 1, 1907.

Entered at the Post Office at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid. DAILY, Per Month. DAILY, Per Year. MUNDAY, Per Year DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year ... DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month . Postage to foreign countries added

Published by The Sun Printing and Publishing Association at 170 Nassau street, in the Borough o Manhattan New York

If our friends who favor us with manuscripts fo ation wish to have rejected articles returned they

Nineteen Hundred and Seven.

must in all cases send stamps for that purpose.

Although in the twelvementh now, opened we shall not witness a contest for the Presidency, the lines on which the next contest will be made are likely to be drawn, and even the choice of standard bearers may be foreshadowed before another year comes around. By that time, too, the outcome of Mr. ROOSEVELT'S policies and the effect of his restless temperament upon events may enable us to forecast the verdict of history upon his administration. On the other side of the Atlantic the New Year promises to be unusually stirring, for in Great Britain, France, Germany, Austria-Hungary and Russia grave problems are pressing for solution. In the Near East and the Far East we shall have occasion to watch experiments in representative government, and in Africa to mark the doubtful fortunes of Morocco and the Congo State. It is to be hoped. too, that the second Peace Conference at The Hague will have met and completed Its labors during the twelvemonth that begins this morning.

The American people have some good reasons for the hope that throughout 1907 their national prosperity will continue. Notwithstanding immense drafts upon our Federal Treasury there is a considerable surplus. There are as yet no signs of the overproduction which brings on a glut, the forerunner of industrial crisis. Notwithstanding the remarkable extent to which near the close of 1906 profits were distributed in the form of increased wages, the dividend paying capacity of railway, manufacturing and mining corporations remains phenomenal. In what degree the earning power of railroads will be affected by the Rate Making act has yet to be determined, and the same thing may be said as to the influence of the Meat Inspection act and the Pure Food act on certain industries. A year hence we shall know definitely whether these statutes require amendment, and if so in what direction. We shall likewise learn how much basis there was for Mr. ROOSEVELT'S optimistic estimate of the progress to be expected in the work of canal construction on the Isthmus of Panama. Light also will be thrown upon the question, now distinctly mooted, whether as a matter of law soldiers belonging to the Regular army can be disbanded by the Federal Executive without a trial before any court, military or civil. Public opinion, moreover, will have had time during the twelvemonth to decide whether it would be expedient for the Federal Government to impose a graduated inheritance tax, which undoubtedly it has a right to do, or an income tax, which would fall within its competence should the United States Supreme Court reverse its former judgment on

Above all, the widespread and solicitous discussion of the speech delivered by Secretary Root at the New York dinner of the Pennsylvania Society should help thoughtful citizens soon to make up their minds as to whether it would be wise or safe to countenance a tendency to the concentration of political functions in the central Government and to the gradnal effacement of State lines. Nothing is more certain than that State rights, county rights and municipal rights are essential to the bracing exercise of the habit of self-government, without which political liberty is a delusion. We see the delusion exemplified in France and in some Latin American republics, where not only the prefects of departments. corresponding to our Governors of States but sometimes even the Mayors of cities and communes are appointed by the national Executive. On the score of prompt and efficient action in an emergency something may be said for a unified as opposed to a federal republic, but the former type of polity is fatal to the practice of local self-rule, which has made Englishmen and Americans what

the subject.

We would not, indeed, deny that a proposal to transform the United States prohibit the States from exercising into a unified republic would fall within the competence of a constitutional convention should Congress be forced to convoke such a body by the demand of it entered into the treaty which it now two-thirds of the State Legislatures; but we do not believe that such a transformation could obtain the necessary assent of three-fourths of the States. We do in New Orleans owing to the limitations not, in other words, deny that a constitutional convention would have the right to propose to repudiate the present Constitution in toto, just as the convention of 1787 proposed to repudiate the preceding Articles of Confederation. Those Articles declared that for an amendment of them the consent of all of the thirteen States was necessary. The convention or whether, postponing ratification, it of 1787, however, paid no heed to this condition, but announced that the new Government would become operative if | depends on the question whether during the Constitution should be accepted by the present session of Congress the relanine States, and as a matter of fact two tions of influential Senators to Mr. Rooss-States, Rhode Island and North Carolina, were malcitrant at the time when the new Federal Government under the Con- rightly or wrongly, with assuming towstitution began. It apparently follows and the proposed investigation of the cirfrom that precedent that a constitutional cumstances attending his disbandment convention held to-day might sweep away the restriction on amendment imposed by the existing Constitution-the restriction requiring the assent of threefourths of the States-and declare on its own authority that the assent of twothirds, or even of a bare majority, would suffice for the proposed changes. The movement in favor of a constitu-

tional convention seemed a year age to Drago Doctrine, which in be acquiring considerable mom but it is likely now to receive a check at the hands of those who have been aroused by Mr. Root to a perception of the danger threatening State rights. The advocates of centralization could hit upon no instrumentality so well qualified to serve their turn as a constitutional convention, which doubtless would arrogate the same tremendous powers that were claimed by the Philadelphia convention of 1787. The recollection of the contempt with which the latter body treated the then existing Articles of Confedera tion, which professed to be perpetually binding, makes the lover of State rights shiver at the thought of a second constitutional convention. It is to be hoped that we shall hear less of that project in the coming year, and that the States which hitherto have favored it will content themselves with the alternative method of emendation, namely, the submission by Congress of amendments to the Legislatures or conventions of three-fourths of the States.

We shall note also with anxiety dur ing the year now opening whether class hatred, which since the general establish ment of universal suffrage had become a scarcely known phenomenon in the United States, but which has acquired such a portentous development in the Roosevelt administration, shows signs of inflammation or abatement. Will common sense and ridicule prove strong enough to cope with blind jealousy and ignorant greed? Can those who clamor for an equal division of accumulated wealth be made to see how insignificant would be their individual profits from a subversion of the existing rights of property? Can they be made to realize, for instance, that if the annual income of a citizen popularly imagined to possess a billion dollars, earning on an average 5 per cent., were to be distributed equally among all the inhabitants of the United States each would receive rather less than 50 cents a year, and that if the capital sum were itself thus divided there would accrue to any given person only about \$12? Can their eyes be opened to the fact that in the vast majority of instances the 50 cents or the \$12 derived from such a distribution would be quickly frittered away, and thus the immeasurable power of usefulness and productivity inherent in the billion as an aggregate would be almost entirely lost? Is it not possible that workingmen, who know by experience what suffering is entailed by the shutting down of factories, will eventually realize that by income taxes, grad-

uated inheritance taxes and other forms of confiscation a capitalist may be driven to remove his accumulations to another country, the products of which may be rivals of American manufactures? One thing is evident: the professional advocates of class enmity, of indiscriminate antipathy to wealth and of wholesale spoliation under the guise of vindictive laws must not be permitted any longer to have the field to themselves. They must be grappled with and unmasked; their socialistic propaganda must be shown to be the silly and cheating thing it is If Mr WILLIAM J BRYAN is now an avowed champion of State socialism and if President ROOSEVELT is drifting in the same direction without knowing it the facts must be brought home to them, and the inevitable consebare, so that the American people may be far better informed a year hence than they seem to be to-day. What of our relations to foreign Powers

and to our transmarine dependencies during the coming year? There is no reason to doubt that we shall continue to be on friendly terms with all the European nations, except in the scarcely conceivable contingency of England's feeling herself constrained to cooperate with her Japanese ally should the last named Power become involved in a war with the United States. Even if the Federal courts should hold that the school board of San Francisco, acting under the laws of California, had a right to relegate Japanese pupils to particular school buildings Japan would have no casus belli, because when Japan entered into a treaty with the United States she must be presumed to have been cognizant of the limitations imposed on our central Government by the Federal Constitution. The second clause of the sixth article of our Federal organic law provides that treaties shall be the supreme law of the land, but only when they are made under the authority of the United States. Where is that authority defined? In the Constitution itself, which by the Tenth Amendment declares that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people. Nowhere does the Constitution authorize the central Government to exercise or control over the public schools within State boundaries. The Tokio Government knew, or should have known, when invokes, that the Kingdom of Italy had failed to secure what it deemed adequate redress for the murder of Italian subjects imposed by our Federal organic law on the treaty making power. We need expect, then, no contest with Japan growing out of the school exclusion in-

cident in San Francisco. Whether the Senate will ratify the treaty concluded by our State Department with the Dominican Republic will allow the present provisional arrangement to go on for another year VELT remain friendly or become inimical. The defiant attitude which he is credited, of three companies of the Twentyfifth (colored) Infantry is not likely to strengthen him in the Senate and bring about quick compliance with his wishes. There is, on the other hand, no doubt that the economical success of the Dominican experiment will predispose many of the Powers represented in the next Peace

of a resolution of the Pan-American Conference at Rio de Janeiro will be advocated at The Hague. The condition to which we refer is an agreement that whenever a Latin American State defaults upon its contractual obligations the Washington Government will undertake to perform the same mediative function between creditor and debtor that it is now discharging in the case of the Dominican Republic. Should the Drago Doctrine be imbedded permanently in international jurisprudence the only loophole for evading the Monroe Doctrine would be stopped. Let us hope | that Congress at this critical conjuncture, when a second Peace Congress is not far distant, will not annihilate the argument best calculated to commend itself to European creditor Powers by rejecting the Dominican treaty.

Whether the first of January, 1908, shall find the American flag waving over Cuba depends upon the Cubans themselves. If even now the so-called Rural Guards with an American army behind them, ready for use in emergencies, are unable to maintain peace and order in the interior of the island what reasonable ground is there for hope that they will be able to do so after the inauguration of a new native Government has been followed by the departure of the American forces? We recognize that, both through the declarations made by Secretary TAFT and through the explicit assertions contained in his own message to Congress President ROOSEVELT is estopped from keeping American troops in Cuba after a new native administration shall have been the outcome of a general election. Those promises, however, were obviously conditioned on the assumption that the political leaders, whether Liberal or Moderate, would have sense or power enough to hold back their followers from brigandage during the short intervening period. Unfortunately the news from the province of Santa Clara indicates that not even for a few months can professional marauders be persuaded to leave property holders undisturbed. It is certain that we should not and will not permit Cuba to become a second Hayti, and if events should convince us during the early part of the new year that our soldiers cannot be withdrawn without exposing the island to catastrophe they will have to stay. A duty was imposed upon us in the name of civilization by the Treaty of Paris.

It is a hope rather than a belief that the Fifty-ninth Congress in its present short session will heed the recommendation made in the President's message that American citizenship be conferred on the natives of Porto Rico, that the harbor of San Juan in that island be dredged and improved and that henceforth the expenses of the Federal court of Porto Rico be met from the Federal treasury. It is even less probable that the "stand pat" majority in both houses will permit a just bill providing absolute free trade with the Philippines, or at least a material reduction of the duties now levied on Philippine sugar and tobacco, to become a law. On the other hand, some extension of the insular railway system may be looked for, and it is expected that next spring the first Filipino legislative assembly will be convoked and the capacity of the islanders for self-government thus tested. With regard to Hawaii, it remains to be seen whether during the coming twelvemonth any considerable measure of success will attend the effort to substitute laborers of European stock for the Japanese now employed in great numbers on the sugar plantations.

In the United Kingdom public attention will be concentrated on the struggle between the Liberals, possessed of an overwhelming majority in the House of Commons, and the Unionists, who seem impregnably intrenched in the House of Lords. It is obvious that we have here the elements of a grave constitutional crisis. The precise function of the upper house in the British constitutional system has never been defined authoritatively; the theory and prac tice of the chamber have differed at different times. Even during the last year Lord LANSDOWNE, the leader of the Unionist majority in that body, has taken positions inconsistent with each other or with any definite view of the rights and duties of the upper house. He has defended the refusal of the peers to pass the Education bill except with amendments unacceptable to the Commons, on the ground that this measure was not a pivotal issue at the last general election and that consequently the Bannerman Government has not received from the country an explicit mandate on the subject. On the other hand, while denouncing as iniquitous the Trades Disputes bill, which relieves trade unions from liability for damages traceable directly to their orders, Lord LANSDOWNE advised his fellow peers to vote for it on the ground that it was the outcome of a peremptory mandate from the British people. As a matter of fact the Trades Disputes bill did not figure so conspicuously in the speeches of the last political campaign as did the Education bill, in which the whole body of English Nonconformists was deeply interested. The truth doubtless is, and we shall be surprised if it is not brought out in Parliament, that in coercing the upper house, much against its will, to accept the Trades Disputes bill Lord Lans-DOWNE had in view no constitutional principle, but simply partisan advantage, desiring to break the alliance between the Laborites and the Liberals, so that the former may be induced to put up candidates of their own at by-elections to fill vacancies, thus enabling a Unionist nominee to beat his Liberal competitor. It was in this way that a Unionist capt ured not long ago the seat left vacant

by the death of Sir WILFRID LAWSON. We probably may take for granted that the Unionist masters of the upper house will throw out or eviscerate by amendments the bill which the Government will shortly introduce for the devolution of considerable administrative and legislative powers concerning Irish affairs upon a central council to sit in Dublin and to be composed partly of elective and partly of appointive members. It is patent that so far as administration goes the purpose of the ings in churches by making a single Conference to accept conditional with Bannerman Cabinet is to abolish the tra-! application, valid for a wear, and that in

ditional and discredited system of "castle | default of such application the Prefect government." The earnest but unavailing attempt to carry such a measure against the opposition of the Unionist peers will largely occupy the energies of the Ministry in 1907, but there are other promises, made to specific sections of the electorate, which will soon have to be fulfilled. The plan of the Liberals manifestly is not to appeal to the constituencies on any single issue, like the Irish bill or the Education bill, but to let the House of Lords fill full the cup of its offences and then go to the country on the single question whether the will of the British nation, expressed through its chosen spokesmen, is any longer to be thwarted by hereditary legislators who practically represent only a single political party.

As regards the foreign policy of Great Britain during the coming twelvemonth, there are indications that the entente cordiale with France is even more firmly riveted than it was a year ago, and there is some prospect of its being followed by the establishment of more friendly relations between Great Britain and Russia than have existed for almost a century. There is apparently perfect concord between the British and the Russian representatives at Teheran, where in other days a change of sovereigns would have caused an active competition for influence. There is reason to think that a like harmony will mark the courses pursued by the British and Russian Ambassadors at Constantinople on the death of the Sultan, ABDUL HAMID, who is scarcely likely to live many months. If Russia, France and Great Britain should act together in the Near East they would be irresistible owing to the vast preponderance of their naval force. That the accession of the present ruler's brother to the Sultanate would hasten the partition of the Ottoman dominions is improbable, in view of the fact that he is said to favor the reformers, who desire a revival of the parliament devised by MIDHAT Pasha some thirty years ago. Public opinion in London and Paris would insist that the Young Turks, or reformers, should have at least one opportunity of making an experiment in self-government.

It is scarcely to be expected that British expressions of esteem and sympathy for kinsmen beyond sea will be quite so fervent and effusive as they were a few years ago. During the Boer war Great Britain found herself isolated, and the ill disguised hostility of Germany and France made her keenly solicitous of securing the friendship of the United States. It was clear, indeed, that if the Washington Government could be trusted to insist upon a neutral's right to convey food staples to a belligerent Britain's to starve her into submission. Now, of sured of support from France in the British Channel and from Japan on the Asiatic mainland, the British Government has no longer any cause to dread an invasion of the British Isles or of the Anglo-Indian Empire. Needing us less. it is but natural that the English should little ashamed, however, when they recall that at the very time when in Affairs, entirely blind to the possible in- to keep their organization intact. was secretly negotiating a treaty of alliance which bound England to assist the Mikado if the latter should become involved in war with any single Power. It is possible that the British people would not permit their Government to perform its treaty obligations should a war arise between Japan and the United States, but we should have more confidence in their amicable intentions if, through Sir EDWARD GREY, they should insist on such an amendment of the Anglo-Japanese Treaty as would permit

Great Britain to remain neutral in the supposed contingency. In France public attention will be concentrated on the Separation law, which became operative on December 12. 1906. From the point of view of the civil power, expressed by M. BRIAND, the Minister of Education, in the Senate on December 28, the Government has treated the Catholic Church with moderation and consideration. It abolished the Concordat, by which it had agreed to pay annual stipends to Bishops and priests, but promised not to stop the payment of salaries to existing members of the episcopate and priesthood, but to apply the law solely to priests afterward ordained and Bishops subsequently consecrated. As for church property, the law gave the Catholics in each diocese and in each parish a year in which to form associations cultuelles, to take over such property as trustees. Even when the Vatican forbade the formation of such associations as being irreconcilable with the canon law, the Government declared that it should hold the church buildings at the disposal of Catholic citizens for purposes of worship on their compliance with a law of 1881 which requires a notice of an intention to hold a public meeting to be given to the civil authorities. The clergy in one archdiocese were about to comply with this regulation, but at the last moment the Pope forbade the priests to sign the requisite notice. Then M. BRIAND said that a notice signed by two laymen would be accepted, and he added that he would strain the law of 1881 in favor of Catholics so as to hold a single notice valid for all the religious meetings to be held during a year. In a good many parishes laymen took advantage of the opportunity thus offered, but it remains to be seen whether the course pursued by them will be sanctioned by the Papacy.

As things stand now, at the outset of the new year, a bill rendered necessary by the events of the last month has been quickly carried through the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate. This bill provides for the immediate transfer of the ecclesiastical property, which the head of the Church refused to retain under the conditions prescribed by the Separation act, to the State, to departments and to communes, and it also embodies in statutory form the concession that laymen may obtain the right to hold meet-

faithful that the church buildings may be used by them for religious purposes during the coming twelvemonth. In other words, the Government has striven to place itself in a position where it could say to Catholics: "You have no grievance to complain of, for your Protestant and Jewish fellow citizens have willingly conformed to the Separation law of 1905, and although you have refused to follow their example we shall still hold the church edifices at your disposal." The Catholics maintain that in the forum

footing from their Protestant and Jewish

Assembly transferred the property of the

Church to the State, the Jews and Protestants had next to nothing to lose whereas the Catholics possessed a large proportion of the most fertile land in France, besides extensive investments in Government bonds and other securities. The equitable rights of the Catholic Church were recognized distinctly by the National Assembly itself, which declared that in taking over ecclesiastical property it accepted the obligation of providing for the cost of worship, the maintenance of the clergy and the relief of the poer. It is true that this duty was repudiated temporarily by the Legislative Assembly, the Convention and the Directory; but it was solemnly reaffirmed by the Consulate in the Concordat signed in 1801. Here, then, say the Catholics, was a moral and a legal obligation definitely acknowledged in a treaty concluded with the Papacy, a treaty which, as it did not provide for denunciation by either party, could be abrogated only with the consent of both. The French Catholics aver that they might have reconciled themselves to the abolition of the Concordat had the civil power left them the liberty of controlling their ecclesiastical affairs that is enjoyed by their coreligionists in the United States. Under the Separation law, however, the control of ecclesiastical property was to be vested not in Bishops and priests, but in secular associations, the inevitable tendency of which would be to give laymen an ascendency not justified by the canon law. Moreover, such secular associations would be under the strict and continual supervision of the civil power. PIUS X held, therefore, that it would be better for the Catholic Church in France to lose its assets than to hold them under such conditions. As for the Pope's refusal to permit priests to give the notices of meetings prescribed by the law of 1881, French Catholics point out that this statute had in view simply the supervision of Socialists and anarchists, and that Continental enemies would never be able to place Christian worshippers in the same category is an intolerable indignity. course, the situation is different. As- It is more difficult to see how they will account for a refusal to profit by the new law, completed in the last week of 1906, whereby as regards the right of holding meetings for religious purposes they are practically remitted to their status at common law. We shall not be surprised to see French Catholics reconcile themcourt us less eagerly. They must feel a | selves to this status in the end. If they insist upon holding meetings in private houses they will run the risk of disinteafter dinner speeches so much was said gration, whereas if they use the church about the ties of blood and of community | buildings which the Government places of interest their Minister for Foreign at their service they will be more likely Early in the new year the German

> general election whether the Reichstag recently dissolved was justified in refusing to vote a supplemental appropriation for the military forces employed in German Southwest Africa. At the coming general election the Centrists, Socialists and Poles will be pitted against the supporters of the imperial policy, who for the moment include not only Conservatives and National Liberals, but also both sections of the Radical party. The campaign now proceeding turns not so much on the inquiry whether the particular sum requested was actually needed for the suppression of the rebellion of the Hereros as upon the fundamental question whether the Reichstag ought not to assert more vigorously its constitutional powers with regard to appropriations. Under the Constitution of the German Empire all money bills and all appropriations require the assent of the popular branch of Parliament. Moreover, the budget must be annual. In practice, however, these provisions are evaded. The most important appropriation, for instance, that for the army, is virtually determined by the law fixing the number of soldiers, and this has repeatedly been voted for a number of years at a time. In like manner a naval construction programme having been voted for many years in advance corresponding appropriations follow as a matter of course. That after some discussion, more or less perfunctory, the Reichstag would acquiesce in any expenditures alleged to be needed to prosecute Germany's colonial policy has hitherto been taken for granted by the Imperial Government. The sums demanded for the purpose have of late years increased with startling rapidity. The whole amount which Chancellor von Buelow has proposed to spend on the colonies this year is almost twentyfive times as much as was voted in any welvemonth up to 1898.

people will be invited to declare at a

That some limit should be set to disbursements for the colonies seems the more necessary because the financial position of Germany is by no means as good as it was a decade ago, the national debt having increased by more than \$600,000,000 during the Von Burlow administration. Moreover, a large deficit is expected in the estimates this year, although last spring new taxes yielding some forty-five million dollars were imposed. The cost of maintaining an immense standing army, coupled with that of distending the navy to proportions undreamed of by BISMARCK, is imposing on the German people burdens that threaten to become intolerable. Those burdens could be lessened if the people's spokesmen in the Reichstag would assert their constitutional right. It is plain, then, that the particular question whether an extra appropriation is really required in Southwest Africa may be lost sight of amid economic considerations of a much broader character.

Representing as they do the national

in a given diocese or the Mayor in a | the Centrists and Socialists might be exgiven parish may notify the Catholic pected to gain a victory at the ballot box if the Reichstag fairly reflected the wishes of the German population. As a matter of fact the seats are very unfairly distributed. Originally each electoral district was to contain a hundred thousand inhabitants (except in the case of the smallest States), but there has been no redistribution according to population in some thirty years. The result is that the large cities, where the Socialists are strongest, are relatively disfranchised, Berlin, for instance, returning only six members, whereas it ought to have three or four times as many. Under the cirof equity they stand on a wholly different cumstances it is not possible to predict with confidence the results of the apfellow citizens. In 1789, when the National proaching appeal to the ballot box in

the German Empire. In the course of 1907 Austria-Hungary will witness events second in importance only to the legislation of 1867, by which the dual monarchy was organized in its present form. Immediately after the holidays the Emperor FRANCIS JOSEPH will sign the bill just passed by both houses of the Cisleithan Reichsrath, the bill whereby universal suffrage is substituted for the indirect and complicated method of voting by which the Austrian Chamber of Deputies has hitherto been chosen. The effect of universal suffrage will be to emphasize the numerical weakness of the Germans, who constitute only a little more than a third of the population of the Cisleithan kingdom. The introduction of universal suffrage in Austria is to be followed by a similar electoral reform in Hungary where at present the members of the Table of Deputies are elected on a limited franchise. Except in the case of the learned professions the franchise depends on the payment of a tax, the size of which varies according to the nature of the property or income on which it is assessed and is not the same in all parts of the country. Electoral reform in Hungary may have grave political conse-

No European country will be watched with keener interest during the year now beginning than Russia, which is about to make a second experiment in selfgovernment. The second Duma will be chosen in February and is to meet in March. That Premier STOLYPIN will succeed in securing a conservative majority in that body must seem doubtful, even to himself. That the number of members returned by the Constitutional Democrats, who organized and controlled the last Assembly, will be reduced considerably is probable enough. It is nevertheless believed by the most competent observers of the drift of things that in conjunction with the Social Democrats and Social Revolutionists-even the latter cannot be prevented from securing a good many seats under the present electoral law-the Constitutional Democrats will manage again to dominate the lower house of the Russian Parliament. Should this belief prove well founded and should the leaders of the Chamber refuse to take part in constructive legislation until the principle of Ministerial responsibility shall have been conceded, the life of the next Duma will be short.

But to what expedient will Premier STOLYPIN then resort? He must have recognized from the outset that from his point of view the fundamental defect in the Constitution granted by NICHOLA II. is the electoral law, which Count WITTE made extremely liberal. The Senate, which is the supreme tribunal. has modified the law so far as it could by judicial construction, but the fundamental features of it remain unchanged. In the event of a dissolution of the second Duma the Reactionary party, which although it has lost its former leaders TREPOFF and IGNATIEFF is still active. will demand the abrogation of the present electoral law and the substitution of another based on property qualification for the franchise. The Premier might ultimately acquiesce in this plan but for the fact that he and his imperial master are committed to the fulfilment of the promise made by the Czar in October, 1905, that thereafter no permanent law should be made without the assent of the people's representatives. That promise is the cornerstone of the new Russian Constitution. Were it broken the Russian people would lose all confidence in their sovereign. What, then, is to be done? On the one hand no Duma will agree to such an electoral law as the Government desires; on the other hand no understanding seems attainable between the Government and any Duma which is the outcome of the present mode of voting. It seems, therefore, to be an impasse,

finds himself, and from which he will struggle to escape during the year now opened. Meanwhile he is doing all he can to redeem his pledges of reform. He has made all the concessions to the Jews that his fellow Ministers would ratify, and he has been authorized by a judicial construction of the statutes to announce that after January 1 the individual peasant will be relieved from collective responsibility for the taxes imposed on his commune, and will be at liberty to demand an allotment of the communal land in severalty, besides acquiring absolute freedom as regards the choice of occupation and residence. This transformation of the communal system into peasant proprietorships is an innovation the tremendous import of which will be witnessed without delay. A distribution of Crown lands and appanage lands is also proceeding on a large scale, and the Government has enabled the Peasants' Bank to advance the purchase money needed to secure allotments from many private estates the owners of which have been induced to sell. Time will be required, however, for the peasants to realize how much they owe to Mr. STOLYPIN, and meanwhile the emissaries of the Constitutional Democrats are telling them that they ought to get land without paying for it and that the existing taxes are far too burdensome.

or blind alley, in which Mr. STOLYPIN

On the whole, no statesman in America or Europe has before him in 1907 so difficult a task as that which confronts the Russian Premier.

In August, 1896, the late DonkLson Car-FREY, then representing Louisiana in the

ned to destruction" by his own party. Having bolted the nomination of BRYAN because he took his stand on the postulate that "party lines cannot hold a man to commit private robbery and spoliation and public dishonor," he was asked to resign his commission as Senator. The members of the Legislature that had recently elected him were united almost to a man in the demand, and the press of Louisiana clamored for his retirement.

With characteristic vigor and plainness of speech Senator CAFFREY refused to sac rifice himself to please the mobocracy. He had been elected, he said, by a sound money Legislature; to no other would be surrender his commission. And be laid down this rule of conduct for the guidance of his fellow Democrats:

"If a set of men temporarily representing a political party violate in their platform the doctrines, tenets and traditions of that party there is not only no obligation on the members of that party to support either the platform or its nominee, but it is their duty to oppose both."

As a principle it is fundamental and imperishable, and at various times men of all parties have taken their resolute stand upon it, as they will do in the future if free government shall endure. Mr. Cappbey's career in the Senate was made glorious, although not popular, by similar exhibi-tions of independence. He lived to see his party abandon the heresy which he had proclaimed to be its dishonor. His courageous act eventually cost him his seat in the Senate, but he retired with the respect of nonest men of both parties. The progress of the South would be more rapid and its influence would be greater if men like DONELSON CAFFREY were permitted to remain in public life.

A LORD PROTECTOR?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN-Sir: I claim the privilege as an old friend of THE SUN and an early contributor to its columns to thank you for your just and fearless arraignment of our impulsive and dangerous Chief Execu-

He has evidently taken his model. Crom well, too much au serieux. That he would like to be our "Lord Protector" is not to be doubted; but it would require a revolution to reach this end. It is questionable, however, whether, notwithstanding the encroschments he has made on the functions of the legislative and judicial departments of government -coequal in dignity and authority with his own executive branch—the country is yet ready for a "New Model" after Cromwell's method.

In spite of Colonel Roosevelt's great herosm and military genius as displayed at San Juan as the leader of the Rough Riders, neither he nor they can be justly compared with the great Puritan commander and his famous "Ironsides": nor could they be depended upon to turn out the Senate as Cromwell turned out the recalcitrant Parliament.

The two most sinister figures on the field of government to-day are the German Kaiser and President Roosevelt, and both of them seem to have come so the parting of the ways a step further and the Emperor may find simself forced to choose between the humiliating "road to Canossa" and a hasty flight across the frontier, such as his ancestor made in 1848.

Mr. Roosevelt will do well to moderate his utterances and consider his acts. In the midst of the great unrest into which he has precipitated the country there are signs of ndignant protest from the great conservative middle class, who are the mainstay of all popular governments-the plain people of common sense. Neither the plutocrats nor the democrats, but those who believe in republican institutions as our fathers understood them and framed them into our organic The Senate may be relied upon to maintain

this law. But if we are to have peace in the land Mr. Roosevelt will do well to mind the wise saying of the wisest of men. "Better he that ruleth his spirit than he that taketh As a consistent member of the Republican

party from the days of the Fremont campaign, it is painful to me to see its principles tisregarded and its fair fame smirched by one t has delighted to honor.

JOHN AUSTIN STEVENS. NEWPORT, December 30.

CHURCH OF THE STRANGERS. New York Institution at Which Every

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN-Sir: Having read the article in to day's Sun on the "Whys or Churchgoers." I beg to state that there is at least one church in New York where most of the object tions stated will not apply. This is the Church of the Strangers, West Fifty-seventh street, near Eighth avenue-the Deems Memorial Church. It vas founded just after the civil war by Dr. Deems and is neither Baptist, Methodist, Episcopal, Pres-byterian nor Roman Catholic, but is an independent church. Its pastor is a Presbyterian and the assist ant a Methodist, I think

There are no pew rents to pay, nor does it rely on fairs, lectures or any other form of entertainment for money with which to pay the running expenses. As there are no pew rents the seats are open

everybody. There is a hospitality committee appointed each year, and there are always two or three of this committee on duty just inside the church, ready to welcome the strangers as they con is no waiting for seats unless one happens to come in during the reading of the Scriptures or a prayer and strangers are not seated in the gallery, but in the body of the church. There is no bunch of envelopes flying around for contributions for this, that and the other thing, and nobody, not even the pastor, knows whether a man gives a nickel or a

As to the theory that the pastor does not know or care whether people come to church or not, just let a regular attendant miss a service and he will either receive a telephone message or a not from the pastor asking in a friendly way why he hasn't shown up. The pastor calls once a year at east on every member of the church and on many non-members who attend service from time to

This letter is written in the hope that it may be of service to the large class of non-churchgoer who would like to attend service somewhere. If they should drop into the Church of the Stranger I fancy they would be kept wide awake by the NEW YORE, December 30.

Wireless Telegraphy a Hundred Tears Ago. TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN-Sir: On page 100 of the second volume of "Tom Burke of Ours," under the chapter "Paris in 1806." is the following: At last a telegraphic despatch announced his Napoleon's arrival at Strassburg." In the same olume, in auother chapter, is another referen elegraphic despatches received by Napoleon. telegraphy known of and used as early as 1806, or was the author just "working it in" for effect?

This is a queer question to come from Bos-Telegraphy was known and practised as early as 1806, but not slectric telegraphy. Napoleon's telegraphic despatches were wireess. They were mechanically wigwagged from hilltop to hilltop.

As to "Licking England."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN-Sir: A corre spondent in to-day's SUN gets off that old false 'gag" about the United States "licking" England 1776 and 1812. This country alone never licked England. The United States and France beat England in the American Revolution, when Eng land was gaining a richer prize. Hindustan. In 1812 England was licking Napoleon Bonaparte out of his boots. He died on an English island